




# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/829,266	04/22/2004	Atsushi Koyama	P25239	6444
7055	7590	11/06/2006	EXAMINER	
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C. 1950 ROLAND CLARKE PLACE RESTON, VA 20191			O HERN, BRENT T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1772	

DATE MAILED: 11/06/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/829,266	KOYAMA ET AL.	
<b>Examiner</b> Brent T. O'Hern	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Brent T. O'Hern	1772	
<b>--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --</b>			
<b>THE REPLY FILED 23 October 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.</b>			
<p>1. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:</p> <p>a) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of the final rejection.</p> <p>b) <input type="checkbox"/> The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.</p> <p>Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).</p>			
<p>Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).</p>			
<b>NOTICE OF APPEAL</b>			
<p>2. <input type="checkbox"/> The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).</p>			
<b>AMENDMENTS</b>			
<p>3. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because</p> <p>(a) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);</p> <p>(b) <input type="checkbox"/> They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);</p> <p>(c) <input type="checkbox"/> They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or</p> <p>(d) <input type="checkbox"/> They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.</p>			
<p>NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u>. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).</p>			
<p>4. <input type="checkbox"/> The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).</p>			
<p>5. <input type="checkbox"/> Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____. </p>			
<p>6. <input type="checkbox"/> Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).</p>			
<p>7. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> will not be entered, or b) <input type="checkbox"/> will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.</p>			
<p>The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:</p>			
<p>Claim(s) allowed: _____.</p>			
<p>Claim(s) objected to: _____.</p>			
<p>Claim(s) rejected: <u>2-6 and 9-11</u>.</p>			
<p>Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>7 and 8</u>.</p>			
<b>AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE</b>			
<p>8. <input type="checkbox"/> The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</p>			
<p>9. <input type="checkbox"/> The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).</p>			
<p>10. <input type="checkbox"/> The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.</p>			
<b>REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</b>			
<p>11. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:</p> <p><u>See Continuation Sheet</u>.</p>			
<p>12. <input type="checkbox"/> Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____</p>			
<p>13. <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.</p>			
 <b>NASSER AHMAD</b> 11/20/06 <b>PRIMARY EXAMINER</b>			
<i>BB10 11-2-2006</i>			

Continuation of 3. NOTE:

Applicant's proposed new claims 12-19, as presented in Applicant's Paper filed 23 October 2006, require further consideration and/or search since the newly presented "circular cavity" and "distance between the base surface of the ring-shaped cavity and the inner base surface of the circular cavity, is between 10 and 300  $\mu\text{m}$ , inclusive" was not previously presented.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicant's proposed amendment will not be entered since the amendment presents limitations not previously considered that require further consideration and search.

In response to Applicant's argument from p. 5, para. 4 to p. 6, para. 1 of Applicant's Paper filed 23 October 2006 that the 112, 2nd para. rejection should be withdrawn, regarding pending claim 5, and Applicant's assertion that the recess and diameter are clearly described in FIG-2 and page 34 of Applicant's Specification, it is firstly noted that that Applicant does not have a page 34. Perhaps Applicant means para. 34. Furthermore, after review of FIG-2 and para. 34 it is noted that claim #5 is still unclear since the diameter of the cavity changes and the surface and the cavity are not equivalent. Furthermore, Applicant is invited to distinctly point out where in para. 34 and FIG-2 the claimed limitations can be found.

In response to Applicant arguments on page 6, para. 2 to page 7, para. 4 that proposed independent claim #12 and the dependent claims are patentable over the cited references, it is noted that claim #12 proposes additional limitations, as stated above, not previously presented that require further consideration and search.

B7C  
11-2-2006